

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1 – 11 remain pending in the application. Applicants have amended claims 5, 7, 10, and 11 to clarify certain aspects of the claimed invention. No new matter is added.

Provisional Rejection of claims 1 – 6 under nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 – 3 of copending Application No. 10/518,212 in view of Self et al. (U.S. Pat 5,634,043)

The '043 patent is commonly owned by the assignee of the present application. For the purpose of expediting prosecution, and without conceding the correctness of the rejection, applicant has filed herewith a terminal disclaimer in order to overcome this provisional nonstatutory double patenting ground of rejection.

In view of the terminal disclaimer it is respectfully submitted that this provisional rejection of claims 1-6 is obviated. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-6 under nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting.

Rejection of claims 7, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsukakoshi et al. (US Pat 6,577,634), hereinafter referred to as Tsukakoshi, in view of Civanlar et al. (US Pat 6,078,963), hereinafter referred to as Civanlar.

Applicants submit that for at least the following reasons, claims 7, 10 and 11 are patentable over Tsukakoshi and Civanlar, either singularly or in combination.

For example, claim 7 requires:

“means for coupling said at least three broadcast router components wherein said input side of each of said broadcast router component is connected, by a discrete link, to each and every one of the other said input sides of said broadcast router components.” (Emphasis added)

In the Office Action, page 4, it is alleged by the Office that in Tsukakoshi, FIG. 2, having the routers interconnected on one side is the same as having the router components interconnected on the input side, as claimed. Applicants respectfully disagree.

FIG. 2 of Tsukakoshi allegedly shows that the routers 12 are interconnected by a router-to-router switch 13. However, Tsukakoshi does not disclose the input sides of the router components are connected to each and every one of the other broadcast routers by a discrete link. Furthermore, Tsukakoshi does not teach or suggest that there is an input side and an output side on each of the router components. Although Tsukakoshi allegedly shows the interconnection among router boxes 12 linking each of their top sides in FIG. 2, Tsukakoshi does not disclose that the top sides of the router boxes 12 represents the input sides of the router components. Thus, the interconnection among routers disclosed in Tsukakoshi does not teach or even suggest that the “input side of each of said broadcast router component is connected, by a discrete link, to each and every one of the other said input sides of said broadcast router components” as recited in claim 7. Therefore, applicants’ claim 7 patentably distinguishes over the Tsukakoshi publication.

The Civanlar patent does not in any way cure the defect present in Tsukakoshi as discussed above. Although Civanlar in FIG. 1 allegedly shows that a plurality of intelligent router ports 103 are interconnected by a switching fabric 102, Civanlar does not disclose that the input sides of the router components are “connected, by a discrete link, to each and every one of the other said input sides of said broadcast router components” as recited in claim 7. Civanlar does not teach or suggest that these connections are among the input sides of the router components. Furthermore, Civanlar in FIG. 2 shows separately a network interface 110 connecting to a network node, and a link to switching fabric (bottom right link). This network interface apparently is used for sending and receiving data. This clearly suggests that the input and output of the router is through the network interface 110, and that the interconnection formed by the switching fabric 102 is not among input sides of the routers. In addition, Civanlar does not teach or suggest that these network interfaces 110 are “connected, by a discrete link, to each and every one of the other said input sides of said broadcast

router components.” Therefore, applicant’s claim 7 patentably distinguishes over the Civanlar publication.

In view of at least the foregoing, claim 7 is patentable over Tsukakoshi and Civanlar, either singularly or in combination.

Similarly, independent claim 10 requires:

“coupling, using a first discrete link, said input side of said first router to said input side of said second router;

coupling, using a second discrete link, said input side of said first router to said input side of said third router; and

coupling, using a third discrete link, said input side of said second router to said input side of said third router.”

In claim 10, the input sides of the three routers are fully coupled by three discrete links. Similar to the arguments discussed above for claim 7, Tsukakoshi and Civanlar fail to disclose that the input sides of the routers are fully coupled by discrete links, and thus fail to disclose the claimed feature: coupling, using a first discrete link, said input side of said first router to said input side of said second router; coupling, using a second discrete link, said input side of said first router to said input side of said third router; and coupling, using a third discrete link, said input side of said second router to said input side of said third router. Therefore, claim 10 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Tsukakoshi and Civanlar.

Claim 11 depends from claim 10 and thus incorporates by reference the features of claim 10. Therefore, claim 11 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Tsukakoshi and Civanlar for the same reasons as claim 10. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection to claims 7, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Rejection of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsukakoshi in view of Civanlar, as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Lydon et al. (US Pat 6,680,939), hereinafter Lydon.

Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 7 and thus incorporate by reference the features of claim 7. Therefore, claims 8 and 9 patentably distinguish over the combination

of Tsukakoshi, Civanlar, and Lydon for the same reasons as claim 7. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection to claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants solicit entry of this amendment and allowance of the claims. If the Examiner cannot take such action, the Examiner should contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6820 to arrange a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview.

Please charge the requisite fee for the Terminal Disclaimer which has been filed concurrently herewith to Deposit Account No. **07-0832**. Please charge any additional fees due or credit any overpayments in connection with the above patent application to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Carl Christensen, et al.

By: /Robert B. Levy/
Robert B. Levy
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 28,234
Phone (609) 734-6820

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

April 6, 2009